

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL  
WORKSHOP SUMMARY**

**DECEMBER 13, 2004**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, December 13, 2004 at 7:02 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Councilmembers Harry Butler, Dennis Kirtland, Bill McCurry, Gregg Palmer, Jim Spehar and President of the Council Bruce Hill. Councilmember Cindy Enos-Martinez was absent.

**Summaries and action on the following topics:**

- 1. RIVERFRONT COMMISSION CO-CHAIRS WILL DISCUSS THEIR REQUEST FOR INCREASED FUNDING:** Co-chairs Paul Jones and John Gormley approached the City Council for funding for a Legacy Coordinator. Steve Moore, also present, is the current Riverfront Partners Coordinator, formerly Legacy Coordinator, and the position they want to talk about. Mr. Gormley reviewed the history of the position. The Legacy Coordinator has been Bob Cron who helped managed the large grant from GOCO that had a lot of projects wrapped into it. The other partners were listed as very numerous and a number of them contributed to the funding of the Legacy Coordinator position. Although the Legacy funding is gone, the benefit of continuing the position is to keep all the other entities apprised of what is going on. The Coordinator also meets with the Commission 4 to 6 times a year to get updated and help the Commission keep track of all the activities being juggled. Each of the partners have been approached for continued funding. The major contributors have been asked to increase their contribution. Most have agreed, although State Parks will not be contributing anything. The anticipated shortfall of \$2500 will be made up by the Riverfront Foundation.

Councilmember Palmer asked how many hours is the position. Mr. Moore said he is paid for 40 hours per month and he donates about 10 to 15 hours more per month. Mr. Gormley said previously this person wrote grants to GOCO and now still writes grant applications especially for the smaller communities.

Councilmember Kirtland noted that as State funds diminish, he feels that the local communities will be asked to do more. He said the assets that are developed through these programs are tremendous and urged the Commission to make sure they protect these assets. He supports the additional contribution for the position.

Councilmember Spehar inquired how previous employees were funded. Mr. Gormley replied one-half by the City and one-half by Mesa County.

Councilmember Spehar asked what the difference is between the administrative person and Mr. Moore's Coordinator position. Mr. Gormley said the administrative position works half days hours four days a week and administers the three boards, their minutes, the concert series and performs general administrative duties. Mr. Moore orchestrates the activities of the 14 partners.

Councilmember Spehar supported the request. The rest of the Council agreed.

**Action summary:** Council agreed to support the request for funding of the Coordinator position.

- 2. LINCOLN PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE:** Staff presented an overview of the work completed to date for the Lincoln Park Study and a summary of the current planning options being studied by the Consultant Team. Parks & Recreation Director Joe Stevens said they would like to review three options that have been developed from the original five options with comments received back. Meetings will continue the next morning to fine tune from this evening and hope to complete the draft by February. The options were presented to the City Youth Council. The main comments related to green space, the swimming pool, the golf element and the stadium location. Mr. Stevens introduced Paul Kuhn of Winston & Associates. The consultant team consists of Sink Combs and Dethlefs, Ciavonne & Associates, Richard Phelps, Ltd, Fox Higgins Transportation Group, Thompson Langford and Burke Associates.

The major improvement elements are extensive and depending on which improvements are done, the cost could be between \$4 million and \$7 million.

Option A – leaves most of Lincoln Park's uses unchanged. From the golf community's perspective, this is the preferred option and it is the least costly of the three options. The stadium improvements outlined in the 2003 plan can be implemented, parking can be improved and the tennis courts can be upgraded and moved out of the parking lot. However, correcting many of the problems identified during this planning process (golf course, maintenance facility, adding more open parkland) simply cannot be addressed with this option.

Option B – a number of significant changes are studied for Lincoln Park. Some of these changes include: the golf course is changed from a full size 9-hole course to a Par 3; most of the land that was occupied by the golf course has been converted to open parkland to give Lincoln Park more of a "Central Park" character; a new North Avenue access and parking lot; the west entry and the Barn relocated or reconstructed next to the Loop's

open turf area; the central parking lot is re-configured to deter short-cutting through the park to the north entry and to create opportunities for pedestrian movement; the central park maintenance facility has been moved out of the center of the park and replaced by smaller facilities dedicated to the Lincoln Park maintenance district, golf and the stadiums. Option B will also address the setback issues from the greens and tees and greatly reduce the number of golf balls that land on adjacent properties or public streets; relocate the tennis courts and increase the number to four new courts.

Option C – would be the most expensive, it would include many of the changes in Option B, but also illustrates a number of new concepts; the golf course is changed from a full size 9-hole course to a Golf Learning and Practice Center; Stocker Stadium will be replaced by a new football/soccer/track stadium in the center of the park; a landscape buffer / open space and parking for Suplizio Field have been added in place of the football stadium in the northwest corner; most of the 30 acres that were occupied by the golf course have been converted to open parkland to give Lincoln Park a “Central Park” character; the Barn would be replaced by a larger “Activities Center”; a new tennis court complex is shown in place of the central maintenance facility; a limited-use connector road is for special event traffic and bus parking, which could normally be closed to deter short-cutting through the park to the north entry.

From the operations standpoint, the two golf options that would be most viable is to keep the course in the current configuration and redo the irrigation system, which is not really income/cost effective, or the golf learning center will give the park the most flexibility, but the operation costs would not be cost effective from the operations standpoint. Option B is the most realistic; it has a Par 3 course, but probably would not be cost effective. Options A & B have improvements but no relocation of the stadium, as by adding a new stadium that would be a much higher cost stated in Option C.

The consultant team recommendation is to combine Options B and C. The team will need additional direction to come up with a preferred option. The first step is to decide which golf option and which stadium option to use.

Ted Ciavonne, with Ciavonne & Associates, pointed out the percentages for each of the options of the general schedules and for golf.

Councilmember Palmer asked about other golf learning centers. Mr. Kuhn said he will find out and get back to the Council. It is a fairly new concept.

Council President Hill said he would not want to eliminate the Barn, but to perhaps enhance it like an activity center with improvements to the area and Lincoln Park that would be able to host tournaments for track, football, soccer, tennis and golf. Council President Hill also likes the parking, but not the football field in option B, and the idea to have a path walkway to the pool area. He asked about the ponds, if that an element needed to take up space with. Mr. Kuhn said the ponds may be needed to enhance the appearance to be more like a park setting instead of a sport area and also the ponds could be converted into use for the irrigation system.

Councilmember Spehar agrees with saving the Barn, maybe to relocate the Barn and the access. Mr. Ciavonne said that there was feedback that the public didn't like that idea. Mr. Spehar said that they also talked about the concept of moving the track and relocating it from the football stadium which would allow more space for soccer and football. The problem he sees in moving the football field would be that there would be a problem with sharing the concessions between the football and the baseball fields. He also can't see supporting the existing nine hole golf course in the condition it is in and then to install a new irrigation system. Also, he doesn't like all of the assumptions on the learning center; he feels that it is a stretch to know if it will be used by all ages. He could see doing either a Par 3 or making it an executive course, he also likes the idea of eliminating Loop Road, increase the parking and a new access to North Avenue in a controlled fashion. He would like to see a new bigger clubhouse and convert the existing clubhouse into an office space.

Councilmember Kirtland likes the learning center concept and to relocate the clubhouse to the maintenance facility location in a more centralized area. He said that he likes the idea of moving the football field but is questioning why it would have to stay in that vicinity. He said that the City could move the football field, soccer fields and track to a different location altogether and by doing so it would give the baseball field a lot more room to develop. He is in support of eliminating Loop Road, keeping the existing nine hole golf course, and relocating the Barn.

Councilmember Spehar said, with the continuing growth, one football field won't be enough for the community.

Councilmember Palmer said that anything the City decides to do, it must be within its ability to do. It will take at least \$15 million to make some of these options happen. He supported having a plan that is do-able. Incrementally, the number one question is the golf, whether it is a 9-hole, Par 3 or an executive course. He also needs to know more about the learning center idea. He would like to see the Barn stay as it has historical significance. He feels that the most important thing to do is to move the

maintenance facility and improve concessions and restrooms. He feels that the community center might be too much.

Mr. Kuhn stated the City could not have the North Avenue access and keep the nine hole golf course. He also heard from staff, that the City could use a larger stadium with artificial turf which would be used every night for multi-purposes. He also talked about one of the problems with the golf course being a learning center is that an experienced golfer won't play on the current course but would use the learning center for practice.

Council President Hill stated that at the lower entrance a reconfiguration could frame the area with the Barn and allow it to be used for gatherings for which it was designed in the first place.

Councilmember Butler likes the concept of the football field and baseball stadiums together with the golf course and green space. He feels that it is an eye catcher for Lincoln Park. He said that he can see building another field somewhere else but likes to have the fields at Lincoln Park.

Councilmember McCurry agrees with Councilmember Butler and likes the course as it is as well.

Councilmember Spehar stated that in option A, the parking north of the Stadium is inadequate, especially for JUCO, for the buses and teams.

Mr. Ciavonne clarified his notes.

Councilmember Butler likes the idea of moving the clubhouse over to the maintenance facility and to include an activity center with parking.

**Action summary:** Council collectively agreed on removing the Loop Road, moving the maintenance facility, saving the Barn and including an activity center. The consultant will keep looking at all of the options and try to resolve some of the other issues that have been brought up.

Recess at 9:08 p.m.

Back in session at 9:14 p.m.

- 3. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF CABLE TV FRANCHISE:** Staff requested that City Council give direction on placing the question for a cable television franchise on the upcoming regular municipal election in April, 2005. City Attorney John Shaver reviewed the current status of the system. There was a major upgrade a few years ago and the City received very few complaints. There are no requests for additional services. Paul Kugler and Shawn Hogue with Bresnan Communications

were present and indicated that they are generally comfortable with the proposal.

City Manager Arnold said that Fruita adopted a franchise ordinance last week, so Bresnan has a franchise with the City of Fruita. City Attorney Shaver stated that if the Council wants to add this to the ballot, it needs to be ready by February 9, 2005.

Councilmember Spehar stated that Bresnan is comfortable in general with this and he just wants to formalize the arrangement the City has with Bresnan. He also has had no complaints so he feels that there is no need for additional outreach. Bresnan has done a good job but suggests the agreement include a five year review or a community assessment. City Attorney Shaver stated the term proposed is relatively short but conforms to what is recommended by the consulting attorney, which concurs with his recommendation.

Councilmember Palmer stated that his son works for Bresnan and just wanted to make that known to the Council. He is also comfortable with the proposal and that he has had no complaints.

City Attorney Shaver stated that the City should then go forward and get it on the ballot.

Council President Hill stated that he wants to make sure that the agreement continues with the 2.5% franchise fee.

Assistant City Manager Varley noted that the franchise agreement will guarantee a City channel to broadcast meetings.

City Manager Arnold referred to the letter from Mr. Beecher and the abilities for additional provisions to be explored. He also suggested maintaining the franchise fee at 2.5% with potential upgrades to be discussed in the future.

City Attorney Shaver noted that with changing technology the City may need to upgrade in five years.

Councilmember Kirtland asked if once this vote is approved, in five years, will the City need another vote? City Attorney Shaver said no, it will be a renewal.

Assistant City Manager Varley stated that Fruita has the ability to add a 50 cent per month fee for their government channel upgrades.

Mr. Kugler introduced Shawn Hogue, the new Bresnan Regional Manager for Grand Junction. Shawn Hogue stated that he has been in the business for 15 years but is new to Bresnan and to the area. He wanted to clarify that in the proposed agreement the term franchise fee has a bigger definition. The term is a matter of discussion and they are happy to work with the City on a local channel. He explained that the 50 cents per subscriber fee is known as the "peg fee" and it is only to be used for capital expenditures.

**Action summary:** Council collectively decided to move forward with a franchise agreement with Bresnan and will move forward with the ballot question by February 9, 2005.

#### **4. VOLUNTEER BOARD VACANCY DISCUSSION**

Stephanie Tuin, City Clerk, reviewed the volunteer board openings. Historic Preservation was the first board reviewed. Ms. Tuin stated that the City has received numerous applications and she needs to know if Council wants to reappoint the incumbent or review other applications.

Council was comfortable reappointing and scheduled the reappointment for January 5, 2005.

Next reviewed was the Visitor and Convention Bureau. Ms. Tuin had previously passed out application packets. Ms. Tuin stated that there are 4 vacancies and she asked the Council to look at their schedules to see if and when they could be available to interview applicants for the 4 vacancies.

Councilmember Spehar stated that they should wait until the first part of January 2005. Council decided on January 6, 2005 at 6:00 for the interviews. Ms. Tuin asked that Council pare the list down to eight candidates to be interviewed and get her that information.

Parks and Recreation received a resignation letter from Bob Cron. Ms. Tuin stated there are three applications in the file. Councilmember Spehar asked to have each of the applications distributed to Council for review to determine if Council would like to advertise or consider the existing applications for the position.

**Action summary:** Council will reappoint the Historic Preservation Board incumbent January 5, 2005, interview VCB candidates January 6 and review the applications in file for Parks and Recreation Advisory Board.

## **5. COUNCIL DISTRICTS BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS**

Council President Hill stated that they are looking at discussing boundary adjustments at the January 3, 2005 workshop and are hoping to accomplish adjusting the population for each Council District. Currently there is more population in 2 of the Council's Districts and there is a need to even out the population. He asked if the public's feedback is needed on changing the districts.

City Attorney Shaver stated that they do not need to have the public's feedback and the Council could adopt any changes by resolution.

Councilmember Spehar stated that back in 2000 the figures were estimated without the final 2000 census figures, and now there is a disparity of 5,000 residents among the Districts.

Councilmember Kirtland said that once this is established, hopefully this will be good for 8 years.

City Manager Arnold stated that there are new maps with minor changes. City Clerk Tuin displayed the maps and explained one possible shift to even out the population.

**Action summary:** Council will review and consider the options and discuss it in more detail on January 3, 2005.

### **ADJOURN:**

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.